

THE COMMISSION,
LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
APOSTOLIC BAPTISM,

IN ITS SUBJECTS AND MODE.

CONTAINING

THE SUBSTANCE OF A DISCOURSE, DELIVERED MAY 25, 1851,

IN THE MEETING HOUSE OF THE FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH,

NEW YORK CITY.

ALSO, STRICTURES ON DR. EDWARD ROBINSON'S ARTICLE ON
BAPTIZO, AND THE LATE DR. SAMUEL MILLER'S REMARKS
ON THAT WORD IN HIS WORK ON BAPTISM.

BY REV. JAMES LILLIE, M.D.

New-York :

PUBLISHED BY E. H. TRIPP, 272 GREENWICH STREET.

1851.

TO SPENCER H. CONE, D.D.

MY VENERABLE AND BELOVED PASTOR,

I know no one to whom I can with so much propriety dedicate the following pages as yourself.

A remarkable Providence guided me to your friendly counsel, when my hereditary convictions on Baptism had given way ; and it was in your pulpit, that the substance of these views was given, on the morning of that day, on which your paternal hand, helped me to follow our Blessed Master fully, when I was "buried with Him by immersion into death."

That your valuable life may be long spared, to dispense the Divine rite to hundreds and thousands of believers, is the prayer of, my dear Pastor,

Your affectionate and faithful brother in Christ,

J. LILLIE.

265.1
L62C

709 23 SEB
22 09 23 SEB

P R E F A C E .

WHEN a man, who for years has been a guide to others in the things of God, changes his views on one of the two great ordinances of Christ, he should not be unwilling to give a reason for his conduct with "meekness and fear." This the author has endeavored to do in the following pages. Had he not believed them fitted in some measure to explain that Divine Rule,—the Apostolic Commission, which surely, like "all Scripture," is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness," he would not have yielded to the opinion of brethren in regard to their publication.

Should any one think that an undue prominence is given to Calvin in the discussion, he is reminded, that the writings of that great man have had, in all probability, more influence than those of any other writer during the last 300 years, in preventing the Reformation from reaching what, in the author's judgment, ought to be regarded as the most ancient, the most inveterate, and most plausible perversion of Apostolic Christianity—infant immersion or sprinkling. He was such an unrivalled combination of juvenile yet matured scholarship and keen comprehensive intellect, as soon to take the lead of Luther himself in guiding the course of the Reformation, and in moulding the minds of its successive generations. If the prevailing opinion regarding

PREFACE.

baptism could be defended, beyond all doubt his was the arm to baffle and prostrate every assailant.

The special attention paid to Dr. E. Robinson, was prompted by the acknowledged talent, learning and piety, of that distinguished cultivator of sacred criticism. These gifts render his mistakes concerning Christ's commands much more dangerous than those of common men, and call so much the more loudly for prompt notice, and careful correction. While exercising his Christian liberty, and obeying his convictions of duty, in pointing out what the author must consider the palpable deviations from the plainest rules of criticism in Dr. R.'s article on *baptizo*, he trusts he has not forgotten his personal obligation for the important aid which he, in common with all the students of the Bible throughout Christendom, has derived from Dr. R.'s past labors.

The late excellent Dr. Samuel Miller's work on Baptism has been selected as the subject of a few strictures, on account of its wide circulation among that denomination with which the writer was recently connected. The author would be sorry indeed, if any thing herein contained, could be justly construed as deficient in respect, to the memory of a man whom it was his privilege to know and love, or as evincing any thing but disinterested affection, to that large and respectable denomination of Protestants, from whom in general he always received the most generous sympathy, and the most liberal appreciation of his very imperfect services.

If this small work shall be owned of God, in leading any of those to whom its author has preached the precious gospel, or any others, better to understand and obey the Divine Author of Baptism, its object will have been gained.

NEW-YORK, 311 Henry St.,
July, 1851.

SERMON.

MATT. 28: 18, 19, 20, "*All power is given to me in heaven and in earth, go ye therefore and disciple all nations; baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and lo I am with you always, even to the end of the world.*"

THESE words were spoken by the Son of God immediately before his ascension to the right hand of his Father. They convey his last commands to his church, and nothing can be more important than that his church should rightly apprehend them. They bring before us the five following topics:

I. Christ's universal authority under the Father, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth."

II. His command to "disciple all nations."

III. His command to baptize the disciples.

IV. His command to instruct the disciples in the keeping of all his laws; and

V. His assurance that his gracious presence should be vouchsafed to his church till his return, "And lo I am with you always, even to the end of the world."

I. Christ's universal authority under the Father, "All power," &c. This power is the foundation of these commands to disciple the nations, and baptize the disciples, and if we truly honor the Son to whom all judgment has been committed, as we do the Father who committed it, we must tremble to think of allowing pride, or prejudice, or inattention, or indolence, or fear of temporal

inconveniences, to tamper with those last injunctions. "The Father hath given Jesus power over all flesh, to give eternal life to as many as the Father hath given him."—*John* 1: 2. "Let all the world know assuredly;"—all the world shall know, sooner or later, "that God hath made that same Jesus" whom the Jews crucified, "both Lord and Christ."—*Acts* 2: 3, 6. "For to this end Christ both died and revived that he might be the Lord both of the dead and the living."—*Rom.* 14: 9. "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus; who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross; wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name that is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."—*Phi.* 2: 5, 11.

II. What, then, is the first command of this universal Lord? "Go, disciple all nations," or as Mark hath it, "Preach the gospel to every creature." Now it seems almost too obvious for remark, that this command cannot possibly have any reference, except to those capable of listening to preaching, and consequently of becoming disciples. It seems impossible, then, to find infants in the apostolic commission. This, however, is not merely admitted, but loudly insisted on by the great theologian of the reformation, John Calvin—and he argues very earnestly that it is impossible to found any argument on it against infant baptism. If it have nothing to do with infants, how, he triumphantly demands, can it prove that infants should not be baptized? The answer is, that very silence is itself a loud prohibition. Baptism is a positive institution, the very essence of which consists in what is simply enjoined. For any one to add to the command or to take from it, is to subvert the authority on which the whole rests. Calvin explodes the sign of the cross, the oil, the saliva, and the blowing of the priest, which Rome has appended to the ordinance of baptism, and he thinks himself

justified on the simple ground that these mummeries are not enjoined. But is this reason not just as strong for denying infant baptism? The law under which the apostles preached and baptized—the law under which the church now preaches and baptizes, says not one word about infants; who then may baptize them, without impeaching the wisdom of the lawgiver? Christ said in effect, baptize *believers*, but not a syllable more. Shall we pretend to obey him by baptizing those who cannot believe?

The whole doctrine of the Sacraments as laid down by Calvin (in the 14 c. IV B. of In.) is inconsistent with infant baptism. He defines a sacrament to be:—

“An outward sign by which the Lord seals on our consciences the promises of his good will toward us, to support the weakness of our faith, and we on our part testify our piety toward him.”

Now as infants have no faith, either weak or strong, it is plain there is nothing in them for the sacraments to act upon, and it is equally impossible for them to meet the other part of the definition of “testifying their piety toward God.” The definition, therefore, throughout, excludes infants. Calvin again defines a sacrament:—

“A testimony of the grace of God towards us, confirmed by an outward sign, with a reciprocal attestation of our faith toward him.”

But an infant cannot receive that testimony, it cannot perceive the sign, it cannot testify its faith; how then can an infant receive such an ordinance? In the IVth Sec. he quotes Augustine with approbation, who demands:—

“Whence does water derive such great virtue as at once to touch the body and purify the heart, except from the word? Not because it is spoken, but because *it is believed*.”

If then the water only benefit through faith—if the heart is purified only by believing the word spoken in baptism, why give the rite to one who cannot believe? The Shorter Catechism imitates this inconsistency. It defines a sacrament as “an ordinance that represents *seals*, and applies Christ and his benefits to *believers*.” How then can it do any of those things to a child that does not believe? It is surely a remarkable fact, that neither Calvin nor the Westminster divines could frame a definition of a

sacrament, that did not by the plainest implication, shut out infants, from all participation.

There is a very remarkable passage in the XIVth Sec. in which Calvin complains of some "who," to use his own words:—

"Attribute to the sacraments I know not what latent virtues, which are nowhere represented as communicated to them by the word of God. By this error the simple and inexperienced are dangerously deceived, being taught to seek the gifts of God where they can never be found, and being gradually drawn away from God to embrace mere vanity instead of his truth. For the sophistical schools have maintained with one consent, that the sacraments of the new law, or those now used in the Christian church, justify and confer grace, provided we do not obstruct their operations by any mortal sin. It is impossible to express the pestilent and fatal nature of this opinion, and especially as it has prevailed over a large part of the world to the great detriment of the church for many ages past. Indeed it is evidently diabolical, for by promising justification without faith it precipitates souls into destruction; in the next place, by representing the sacraments as the cause of justification, it envelopes the minds of men, naturally too much inclined to the earth, in gross superstition, leading them to rest on a corporeal object rather than in God himself. Of these two evils I wish we had not such ample experience, as to supersede the necessity of much proof. What is a sacrament taken without faith but the most certain ruin of the church?"

This is worthy of the reputation of Calvin as a teacher of righteousness. But then, how does it harmonize with what he declares in the next chapter, Sec. III?—

"We ought to conclude at whatever time we are baptized we are at once washed and purified for the whole life."

That is, every one who has been sprinkled in infancy "ought to conclude himself washed and purified for his whole life." Now can human wit shield Calvin from his own denunciation of teaching diabolical doctrine? He assures me that the baptism which I cannot remember, and never knew, purifies me for my whole life, and yet declares that to promise "justification without faith, precipitates souls into destruction, and sacraments without faith are the ruin of the church." Can a man be washed and purified for his whole life without being justified? No wonder Puseyites and anti-Puseyites claim Calvin. Thus it must ever turn out, when men,

however strong, attempt impossibilities. Samson will gain his end no matter whether he grapple with the gates of Gaza or the pillars of Dagon ; they will bow before the power that his hand wields ; but if in an evil hour he lay his head in the lap of Delilah, and listen to her counsels, he shall become the scorn of the enemies of God, and weak as another man.

This undeniable contradiction will be found to pervade the theology of all the Reformed denominations. For example, it meets us in the Shorter Catechism, which defines baptism as "sealing our engrafting into Christ, and partaking of the benefits of the covenant of grace;" and yet declares that "sacraments do not profit by any virtue in them, but solely by the blessing of Christ and the working of his Spirit in them that *by faith* receive them." Here all those sprinkled in infancy, are taught, that baptism sealed their engrafting into Christ, and their partaking of the benefits of the covenant of grace, but all undue elation at the value of the favor is taken away, when we are assured, that without faith, it is impossible either baptism or the Supper can do us any good. Unless then, we *can* believe, that we *did* believe, when we were babes, we are not likely to derive much encouragement from what was done in our infancy.

The Westminster Confession (ch. 28,) declares baptism a "sign and seal of regeneration and remission of sins to the party baptized." Yet (in chap. 11.) we are assured that "faith receiving Christ is the alone instrument of justification", and consequently of remission of sins. Thus the Confession teaches a double remission ; the first, when baptism seals us the children of God, and the second, when we believe. But this second remission would seem to be a superfluity, because, as the Confession says (28 : 6) "the efficacy of baptism, is not tied to that moment of time wherein it is administered." It is therefore a perennial fountain of remission, and if so, it washes out our sins, as fast as they are committed. *What then is left for faith to do ?* Is it not made void ? And if Luther was right when he said, that justification by faith alone, was the article of a standing church, and if Calvin was right, when he declared sacraments without faith, to be the ruin of the church, what must we think of *infant baptism* as set

forth by these excellent Reformers, and the learned and pious Divines of Westminster?

The otherwise admirable forms of the Synod of Dort are spoiled and eaten through by this moth. The Heidelberg Catechism in the 25th Lord's-day, assures us that "we are made partakers of Christ, and his benefits by *faith* only"; but in the 26th we find out that there must be some mistake about it, as we are told "that Christ appointed this external washing with water, adding thereto this promise, that I am as certainly washed by his blood and Spirit from all my sins as I am washed externally with water." Before "faith came," then, to my soul, yes, long years before, I was, it seems, *all* washed. In the Compendium, &c., we are told "we are righteous before God only by a true faith in Jesus Christ," and yet "the water in baptism seals the washing away of our sins by the blood of Christ." Of course, then, we are righteous long before we have faith. In the Confession, &c., chap. 22, "Faith is the only means of justification;" but in chap. 34 we are assured that when "the Ministers administer that which is visible, the Lord gives invisible grace, washing our souls, renewing our hearts, putting on us the new man," and that "this baptism doth not only avail us at the time the water is poured on us, and received by us, but also through the whole course of our life." "Therefore," the good fathers add, "we detest the error of the anabaptists." The Liturgy of the Reformed Dutch Church tells us "when we are baptized in the name of the Father, God the Father witnesseth and sealeth unto us that he doth make an eternal covenant of grace with us and adopts us for his children and heirs, and therefore will provide us with every good thing, and avert all evil, or turn it to our profit," &c.

It may be well for the orthodox of the Presbyterian, and Ref. Dutch Churches, to consider, how far they differ from the Bishop of Exeter, and the church of Rome, on the subject of baptism.

The Catechumen in the Episcopal church is asked by the Bishop, What is your name? and answers N. or M. Bishop.—Who gave you this name? Cat.—My sponsors in baptism; wherein I was made a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven. In the form of the

public baptism of infants, the minister, after dipping the child discreetly, or pouring water on it, &c., &c., says, "this child is regenerate, and grafted into the body of Christ's church." And the 27th Article of Religion teaches that "the promises of the forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed in baptism. Yet the 11th Article declares that "we are justified by faith only." Mr. Gorham holds by the one Article; his Bishop by the other and by the form and Catechism. Both are inconsistent and partial; why not insist equally on all?

The Catechetical instruction of the Episcopal churches of America and England, just quoted, has been adopted by the Methodist Episcopal church:

Sensible that it was impossible to vindicate infant baptism from the Apostolic Commission, Calvin took care to transfer the cause from the New Testament to the Old, from the command of Christ to the covenant of Abraham; and all succeeding generations of Paedobaptists have found it necessary to follow his example. But this seems a virtual abandonment of the field; for where must the mind of Christ be looked for, on the subject of baptism, if not in the very law of baptism itself. Is it possible that Christ's little ones, cannot understand their duty on baptism, whether in regard to themselves or their children, without unravelling all the intricacies of the Abrahamic Covenant?

The argument from circumcision proceeds on the assumption that the Christian rite, has come in the room of the Abrahamic. But surely this is not self evident, and how is it proved? There is not merely no scriptural authority for such an allegation, it may on the contrary be demonstrated to be utterly inconsistent with the plainest facts in the apostolic history. For if baptism has come in the place of circumcision, how could there have been any controversy whether circumcision were binding on the Gentiles? How could the Council at Jerusalem have been so inconsiderate as to forget to cut the matter short, by declaring the alleged fact of the one ordinance having supplanted the other? How could Paul, writing to the Galatians on the very subject of the freedom of the Gentiles from the yoke of circumcision, fail

to remove every scruple from the minds of the Galatians, by assuring them that their baptism was intended by Christ to take the place of the ancient rite? But he was entirely silent on this modern substitution. Nay, how could Paul take Timothy, and circumcise him after he had been baptized, if the one ordinance just filled the place of the other? This surely was a superfluous labor,—a most unnecessary interruption of the labors of the Evangelist.

In answer to the demand of the opponents of infant baptism, for some express command, or example authorizing the practice, it is usual for Paedobaptists, to call for evidence, that the spiritual relation between the Jew and his child, has been abrogated under the gospel. Great indignation is expressed, that the situation of infants under the gospel should be worse than under the law. Now it is sufficient, to shew the hollowness of this pretext, to remember that the supposed spiritual connexion, between the Jew and his child, is a mere gratuitous assumption, contradicted by the plainest facts in the case. Ishmael was circumcised as well as Isaac, but surely he was not a spiritual descendant of the patriarch. Esau as well as Jacob had the sign, but was no son of Isaac by faith. Grace never ran in the blood under the law, any more than under the gospel. The profaneness of the vast majority of the descendants of Abraham in all ages, demonstrates that if circumcision was intended to seal the personal righteousness of the circumcised, it generally failed; it was a seal hanging to a blank or blurred parchment. As the God of Abraham is a God of truth and order, he never appointed such a seal. True, he did promise to be the God not only of Abraham but *of his seed*, but that promise never bound him to take Annas and Caiaphas to his bosom, or to recognise Judas as any thing but the "Son of perdition." Yet they all had the seal. That seal then was never intended to signify the renewed nature of ordinary receivers. It was a seal of the righteousness of the faith of *Abraham* and of no other man; for it is of him alone that Paul declares, Rom. 4:11, "And he received circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which *he* had yet being uncircumcised." But it was no seal of faith in either Isaac or Jacob,

because when put on them they had no faith to be sealed. Now it is only by the gratuitous and groundless extension to all the descendants of Abraham, of what was true of Abraham alone, that any color has been given to the argument for infant baptism. It has been asserted thousands of times, for hundreds of years, (no wonder it is generally believed in a world like this,) God bestowed spiritual blessings on the sons of Abraham, and sealed these blessings with circumcision. Similar blessings are conferred on the children of believers, and they are sealed by baptism. But the whole fabric falls, when it is perceived, that circumcision never performed any such office, and we need not be surprised if infant baptism, proceeding on a mistake so palpable, should in all ages have shown itself as inefficacious in securing the piety of the recipient, as the severer rite under the patriarch. Still the promise concerning the seed was not in vain. It had a threefold aspect. It was mainly fulfilled in Christ. "He says not to seeds as of many, but to thy seed which is Christ." Secondly, it concerns all believers under the gospel who are "blessed with faithful Abraham," and "heirs according to the promise." And lastly, it secures the ultimate restoration of the literal Israel and the final salvation of the nation, for the "beloved for the fathers' sakes shall be grafted in again," and "all Israel shall be saved." Rom. 11. Circumcision had thus a threefold significancy. It marked out the nation in which the Savior of the world was to be born; it was a symbol of the purity which was to be the characteristic of the true Israel of all ages, and it was a badge of the wonderful race who were always to "dwell alone" and never "to be reckoned among the nations."—Num. 23 : 9.

This spiritual meaning of circumcision is the fact relied on in the paedobaptist argument. Baptism it is alleged has the same meaning. The two rites then are the same in substance and differ only in form, and if an infant received the one by divine appointment, why not the other? Just because God has not required it. He commanded Abraham to circumcise his male children, but has not commanded us to baptize any of our children. Both are merely *positive* commands and obedience to each must be

limited exactly to the *word* of the precept. To say that because both signify the removal of moral defilement, they ought therefore to be administered to the same subjects, is to substitute a human inference for a divine command. Besides, the paedobaptist is inconsistent even on his own principle. For baptism and the Lord's Supper signify substantially the same thing—the application of the blood of Christ for our cleansing. If then infants receive baptism, why not the Supper? So reasons the Greek church, and so far she is consistent. So doubtless fancied the superstition of the 3d century, which brought forth infant communion as the twin of infant baptism.

The first names in the Biblical Criticism of Germany, have abandoned the argument from circumcision, in behalf of infant baptism, as well as all the supposed proofs in the New Testament. Schleiermacher confesses “all traces of infant baptism, which one will find in the New Testament, must first be put into it.” Gesenius, Neander, Olshausen, indeed the German scholars generally, though belonging to paedobaptist churches, never pretend that infant immersion, or any other form of the rite, was practised by the Apostles. Still they vindicate infant baptism on their own ground; and thus their testimony has all the weight peculiarly and properly belonging to the evidence of adversaries. They contemplate the church as a living body, going on to perfection, developing herself in accordance with her divine constitution. They argue, therefore, that although Paul knew nothing of infant sprinkling, the church had a right to introduce both, in her progress toward ideal perfection. For example, Neander tells us that the word *holy*, applied in 1 Cor. 7:14, to the children of mixed marriages, contains the germ of infant baptism, though the Apostle was not aware of it. So then this modern converted Jew, (modest as his admirers fancy him,) pretends to know more about that epistle to the Corinthians, than the ancient Jew converted on the road to Damascus, whom the Holy Spirit employed to pen the letter. The man who studied theology among the infidels of Germany, is wiser it seems about a Christian ordinance, than he who was admitted a student in the highest heavens, with Moses and Elijah, Gabriel and the angels, as his

fellows!! I cannot believe this. On the contrary I denounce it as a daring device of Satan, to make it impossible "to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints." Jude who gave that injunction, evidently supposed that the faith was something divinely perfect in itself, which, amid all attempts to corrupt it, was to be appealed to as delivered by the Divine Savior to men "chosen before of God." Nay, how did the Savior refute the licentious expounders of the law of marriage, but by pointing them to paradise, and reminding them how things were "at the beginning."

In exposing the formalists who destroyed the fifth commandment, Christ brings them back to the simple institute. The corrupters might have pretended that the change which they had introduced was a more perfect development of divine life in the church; that the Mosaic command merely called for a gift to an earthly father, but their improvement, had elevated it into a gift to their Father in Heaven. But however ready to find excuses for their wickedness, they seem to have been totally ignorant of this German refinement, and had not a word to say when Christ told them "ye make void the law of God by your traditions."

Let these Germans then be kept in their own place. As witnesses about a fact in Church History, we give them all homage. About the inference to be drawn from the fact we will think for ourselves. They allow that Christ commanded believers alone to be baptized, and that the Apostles never imagined infants to be included. As followers of them, even as they were of their Lord in this, we dare not baptize an infant.

III. I come now to the command, *baptize* the disciples; "baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit". What are we to understand by the word *baptizantes*, in Christ's command? There has been much useless wrangling, about a very plain matter. Calvin tells us in his Institutes, "it is agreed that the very word signifies to immerse, and that the rite of immersion was observed by the ancient church." Luther declares "the term *baptismos* is a Greek word. It may be rendered a dipping, and though that custom be quite abolished among the generality, (for neither do they

entirely dip their children, but only sprinkle them with a little water,) nevertheless they ought to be wholly immersed." Salmasius says, "*baptismos* is immersion; and was administered in ancient times according to the force and meaning of the word. Now it is only *rhantism*, or sprinkling, not immersion or dipping." "Christ commanded us," says Beza, "*baptizesthai* by which it is certain immersion is signified." Vitranga declares "the act of baptizing is the immersion of believers in water." This "expresses the force of the word. Thus also it was performed by Christ and his apostles." "*Baptismos* and *baptisma*," says Burmannus, "if you consider their etymology properly signify immersion." "And Jesus when he was baptized went up straightway out of the water." Casaubon, whom the haughty Horsley compliments as one of the three to whom he would take off his hat on a question of Greek philology—Scaliger and Bentley being the other two—Casaubon, I say, declares "This was the rite of baptizing, that persons were plunged into the water, which the very word *baptizein* sufficiently declares. Whence we understand it was not without reason, that some long ago insisted on the immersion of the whole body in the ceremony of baptism." Richard Bentley, (the man to whom Horsley would doff his mitre on Greek,) explains *baptismous*, *dippings*. Bossuet, Bishop of Meaux, the subtlest adversary of protestantism, declares, "To baptize signifies to plunge as is granted by all the world." John Selden, unrivalled in his knowledge of Ecclesiastical antiquity, tells us "In England, of late years, I ever thought the parson baptized his own fingers rather than the child."

John Milton, the most learned as well as sublimest of all poets, in his *Paradise Lost*, B. 12, describes the apostles as going forth

"To teach all nations what of him they learned
And his salvation; *them who shall believe*
Baptizing in the profuent stream, the sign
Of washing them from guilt of sin, to life
Pure."

Porson, who succeeded Bentley as the greatest Grecian of his age, being asked by an Episcopalian whether they or the Bap-

tists were right about *baptizo*, smiled and said, "The Baptists have the advantage of us, it means immerse and nothing but immerse."

Here we have twelve witnesses of every country, of every creed, Protestant, Popish and Congregational, all agreeing with one mouth regarding the meaning, the *exclusive* meaning, of the word that Christ employs. It is immerse, and so far as we can find from them, nothing but immerse. And when we remember that not one of these *practised* immersion, and that, so far as their opinion went, it condemned themselves, surely we have a much clearer and more convincing body of evidence, than can be produced on any other matter, that has been so much controverted.

In answer then to our question what are we to understand by the word *baptizantes* in our Lord's command, the word will bear no meaning but *immersing*.

If this requires any farther illustration we may find it by reflecting on the simple question, Is it not certain that our Lord must have meant that believers in his name, should be baptized, in the same mode, in which he himself was baptized by John? Now was that not by *immersion*? Why was the rite performed in the Jordan? Was it that the Baptist might sprinkle or pour a few drops on that sacred head which bowed on the tree for us? Calvin, commenting on John 3:22, 23, says, "But we may gather from these words that baptism was celebrated by John and Christ by a submersion of the whole body." Nor does Calvin stand alone. The greatest names in sacred literature for 1500 years might be produced by scores to prove the same thing. *If any thing is certain in the Bible, this cannot be reasonably denied, that Christ commanded believers to be immersed, and that before he gave the command, he set them the example.* If then in all things he set us an example, that we should follow his steps, how comes it to pass that the vast majority of *believers* have never followed their leader, beneath the mystic element? If ever a great mind in modern days feared God, and desired to honor his Son, that mind, as I think, was John Calvin's. How came it to pass then, that this mighty intellect, illumined with

all the learning of ages, and breathing daily unwearied devotion to his God and Savior, should have allowed that Christ commanded believers to be *immersed*, and *did as he commanded*, and that he (Calvin) lived and labored and died without ever doing as his Lord enjoined? Here is a paradox that may well puzzle the Christian Philosopher! In the very passage where Calvin confesses that Christ was submersed, he seems to have feared that the reader might have some misgiving whether it might not be necessary to follow Christ's example, and immediately adds, "But we need not trouble ourselves about the external rite, provided it agree with spiritual truth and with the institution and rule of the Lord." "*The institution and rule of the Lord!*" Why, Calvin! have you not just told us that Christ was submersed? Have you not said that when he gave his command he said, Teach all nations, immersing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and the Holy Spirit? Can any thing agree with his institution, and rule, and example, but immersing believers? When you were in your mother's arms, and *could* not believe, a few drops were sprinkled on your face by a slave of Antichrist. Call you that a compliance with the rule and institution of Christ? How have you been led to fancy that sprinkling a few drops on the face of one that does not believe, should be the same as immersing a believer? Is sprinkling immersing? Is a babe, that knows not its right hand from its left, a believer?

The "*spiritual truth*" likewise, demonstrated by Paul, (Rom. 6: 3, 4,) is completely lost sight of in the human invention of infant sprinkling. "Know ye not," says the Apostle, "that so many of us, as were immersed into Jesus Christ, were immersed into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by immersion into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead, by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." Here we are taught that the believer's death with Christ to sin, is symbolized by his burial in the water, and his rising with Christ to a new and heavenly life, is figured in his rising from the watery grave. This great lesson is entirely lost in infant sprinkling. There we have no mystic burial, nor resurrection, and the faith that embraces the Savior, which is the

foundation of the whole operation, having no place in infants, the spiritual meaning of the ordinance, as well as its symbolical expression, must be entirely lost. This exposition, so simple, beautiful and expressive, has commended itself not only to the universal acceptance of the Baptists, but to the general adoption of infant baptizers of the highest learning and piety, from Chrysostom to Chalmers, for 1400 years. It is plain that Calvin's external rite just as little agrees with "*spiritual truth*" as with "the institution and rule of the Lord."

Calvin's comment on the baptism of the Eunuch is entitled to special notice.

Acts 8: 38—"Here we clearly see what was the rite of baptizing among the ancients; for they plunged the whole body into water. Now the practice has prevailed for the minister merely to sprinkle the body or the head."

Now, we are here entitled to ask, who were the ancients that plunged the whole body into water? Were they not *Christ* and his Apostles? Who came after them in the Christian church, that were entitled to originate a different practice? Calvin allows that Christ said *immerse*, at the very time when he declared "all power is given me in heaven and on earth." Is it not a daring assault on the mediatorial authority of the Lord for any mortal to say sprinkle? It is of no use to tell us the practice of sprinkling "*has prevailed.*" We still demand by whose authority? Did Christ repeal his statute of immersion? No! But Calvin tells us "such a trifling difference as that between sprinkling and immersion, is not a matter of such moment, as that we should on that account divide the church or disturb it by brawls." Such a *trifling* difference, most illustrious Reformer, and where did you learn that the difference was *so trifling*? "*Tantillum*" forsooth! Does not the Lord whom you adore and for whom you would daily lay down your life, say *immerse*? Do you not say it is allowed he said so? Well, was the word a *trifling* one? My brethren, did HE ever speak a trifling word, from the hour when he astonished the doctors in his Father's house, till the hour when he said *immerse*? Nay, I exult in the belief that even in the days of his mysterious childhood, no trifling word ever fell from those lips. If it be true, his enemies being witnesses, that man never spake like *this*

man, is it too much for his friends to believe, that never child spake like that child? It is however not unreasonable to suppose, that the longer he tabernacled on earth, his words increased in awful significance as he drew near Gethsemane and the cross, till in the one he cried "Oh my Father, if it be possible let this cup pass from me," and on the other, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" And when after these unimaginable horrors, he bowed that divine head and said "*it is finished,*" came forth from the darkness of Joseph's tomb, stood on the mount of Olives just before sitting down a victor on his Father's throne, and said, "All power is given to me in heaven and earth; go ye therefore and teach all nations, *immersing* them into the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit;" Oh, dare we even hint that one of these divine words is *trifling*? And yet if it was a trifling matter whether he said *immerse* or *sprinkle*, as most take the liberty of fancying, then it is impossible to shew that *immerse* was not a trifling word—an unmeaning phrase.

But then Calvin was afraid, it seems, he might divide the church or disturb it by brawls, if he insisted on *immerse*. This was not spoken like the master in Geneva. When he had all his wits about him, no man of his day knew so well, that if divisions and brawls arose, in consequence of our simply standing to Christ's plain word, these could not be laid at our door, but justly belonged to those who would not bear, what the Master said. But when he abused his apostolic influence, to mislead all Reformed christendom, about his Lord's last words; when he presumed to tell his followers that *sprinkling* would do very well, while he knew and acknowledged, that Christ said *IMMERSE*, he did not speak like himself, but as the Dragon, and his followers in believing him, preferred the word of the Dragon, to the testimony of Jesus.

In order to reconcile his candid admission with his popish practice, Calvin goes on to say, "for the ceremony of baptism, in so far as it has been delivered to us by Christ, we should rather die a hundred deaths than allow it to be wrested from us." Very well! And where has Christ delivered the ordinance to us, if not in the Apostolic Commission? Calvin allows

that *there* Christ said immerse. What right has he to say sprinkle? He maintains that Christ said immerse believers. What had he to do with infants under the commission? In both points he contradicts his Master and plays the Pope. Still toiling at contradictions, the Giant of Geneva persists in his assault on the foundation of heaven, which is the word of the Son of God.* “But since in the symbol of water, we have a testimony, not merely of our ablution, but of a new life, since in the water Christ represents his blood to us in a glass, that we may thence seek our cleansing; since he teaches us that we are renewed by his Spirit, that dead to sin we may live to righteousness, it is certain we want nothing essential to baptism.” Now it is remarkable, that here Calvin says not one word, about sprinkling or pouring the water. He represents the bare presence of the element as sufficient, so that if the minister should barely point to the water, without so much as moistening his finger, nay, without even pointing, say the water is the symbol of the blood of Christ, I baptize thee in the name, &c., so far as is here taught, the essence of baptism would be there. It is not however in looking at the water as a glass merely, that we have a symbol of our death and resurrection with Christ. To have that symbol, we must be buried in the water, and rise out of it again, as our Lord rose out of the Jordan, and the grave, after his burial in both. *Rom. 6: 4.*—“Therefore we are buried with him by immersion into death, that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.”

The scholars of Germany agree in declaring immersion to be the meaning and *the only meaning* of *baptisma* in the New Testament. Schleusner, Wahl, and Bretschneider, the three great sacred Lexicographers, are unanimous in restricting the meaning of the term to immersion. Neander, Olshausen, and indeed all the great names in German Criticism, are agreed in this. Schleusner it is true falls into an odd inconsistency in defining the noun *baptisma* in the New Testament, immersion, and the verb *baptizo*, by wash; denying that *it there* means immerse. I call this an inconsistency; for it is just as if we should allow that baptism in English means immersion, and deny at the same

* Ps. 33: 6. Gen. 1. Heb. 1.

time that baptize ever means immerse. Schleusner does not pretend to give any reason for his singular assertion. And doubtless it is common enough, when a man has no reason to give for an opinion, to rely entirely on naked dogmatism. He gives baptizo in Latin as the ordinary meaning of the same word in Greek. This however is not explaining the language, it is merely throwing a mist over the light of God. If Schleusner believed wash to be the meaning of *baptizo* in the New Testament why did he not always explain it by that meaning? Why wrap up the great mass of cases where the word occurs by the barbarous Latin baptizo—thus giving students the precious information, that *baptizo* means baptizo. It is utterly inexcusable, to handle God's plain word so as to veil its meaning, lest we should shock the prejudices of the day in which we live.

Yet how common has this been with the best men. Campbell of Aberdeen declares the meaning of *baptizo* to be immerse, and cannot conceal his contempt for the partizans who insist on sprinkle or pour. Yet in his translation he uses baptize, which he knew as an English word *in his day* did not mean immerse, but merely christen, or religiously to sprinkle or pour. Perhaps he felt it might occasion ecclesiastical trouble, to be so strenuous about immerse, as to insert it in his translation, and as a kind of compromise between conscience and convenience, put the meaning into the note, and the veil into the text.

Calvin as we have seen is quite decided about what he calls the acknowledged meaning of *baptizo* as immerse, and yet he puts the very word baptizo into his Latin version. Now what was the sense of using a word which needed explanation, when the plain word which told its own meaning was at hand? If it was his intention to prevent the reader from feeling continually the jar between the practice of Geneva, and the clear command of Christ, he certainly took the best plan to carry it into effect. But I am altogether unwilling to suppose this, as he again and again acknowledges in his commentary, that the word means immerse, and that John and Christ immersed. Still it is clear the Latin word baptizo in Calvin's day, no more than baptize in ours, meant immerse. It was merely an ecclesiastical term denoting a religious ceremony; else why did he find it necessary

again and again to tell his reader that John and Christ immersed. Had he translated Matthew, in accordance with the Greek language and the truth of the case, he would have said, "Then came Jesus from Galilee to the Jordan to John, to be immersed by him." And so the Eunuch would have been made to say, "Behold water ! what hinders me from being immersed ;" and the narrative would have declared, "And both Philip and the Eunuch went down into the water, and he immersed him." Had Calvin translated thus, he would have allowed the Holy Spirit to speak the same ideas in Latin, that he formerly did in Greek. And this surely would have been better, than first to constrain him, to utter the jargon of Jerome, and the man of sin, and then, compelled by fidelity to the truth, to expound the word, lest his readers should be puzzled or misled.

Jerome, in transferring the word into the Vulgate, merely copied the Italic version, which some make as ancient as the second century. But even in that early age, Christ's simple ordinance had become contaminated by human additions. The sign of the cross, anointing with oil, and the use of milk and honey, were all already appended ; and consequently the word baptizo, whether used by the Greeks in Corinth or by the Latins of Rome, would necessarily *now* express a great deal more than it did as used by Plato, and Josephus, and Paul. Immingere in Latin, no more than baptizo in Greek, could express all that superstition was now cramming into the rite ; and we have no difficulty in understanding why the Italic translator should have felt it necessary to transfer the word and not to translate it. By this means all inconvenient scruples and questions, about the original simplicity of the ordinance, were cut off.

Dr. Robinson also adopts the plan of transferring the word, in the great majority of instances where it occurs. Indeed there is a remarkable similarity between his article and Schleusner's. This is the more noticeable as he does not refer to Schleusner at all in the preface to his last edition, while he mentions Bretschneider and Wahl, as cultivators of sacred criticism, since his former edition in 1836. Schleusner published his third edition in 1807, and yet Dr. R., notwithstanding what he calls the

"onward progress of science" since '36, brings forward the blunders of fifty years and more, while he says not one word of what Bretschneider has done. Where he deviates from Schleusner he goes wrong—singularly, glaringly wrong. The very high reputation which Dr. R. deservedly enjoys, makes it only the more imperative, that his errors as a professor of sacred literature, and the public teacher of thousands of ministers by the press, should not be concealed.

1. Dr. Robinson avoids Schleusner's inconsistency of making the noun *baptisma* always signify *immersion* in the New Testament, and yet denying that its verb *baptizo*, ever there signifies immerse. This was a little too gross and therefore Dr. R. translates *baptisma* baptism, and makes it not quarrel with its parent *baptizo*. But then to secure this harmony, he suppresses, (unintentionally of course,) the truth which Schleusner acknowledges, that *baptisma* always means immersion in the New Testament. But like most desperate attempts to secure peace, when at bottom there is no peace, the Dr.'s device fails. For he allows that *figuratively*, *baptisma* signifies Matt. 20: 22, 23. *overwhelming* calamities. Now it would be singular, if an overwhelming calamity were called *figuratively baptisma*, if *baptisma* literally were not something overwhelming. So hard is it for error to be consistent.

2. Like Schleusner Dr. R. next states the classical meaning of *baptizo*, and corrects him by declaring it to mean *invariably* immerse, on which point Schleusner is not explicit. But then what he adds spoils the definition.* For he says the word also means *to immerse partially to the breast*, and quotes in proof Polybius, "the infantry immersed up to the breasts." Now it is almost too plain for remark, that, so far as this passage is concerned, the idea of partialness is not contained in the *word*. The partialness of the operation is implied in the phrase *up to*, and the limit of the operation is marked by the word *breast*. As well might Dr. R. in explaining *bapto* have told us it means to dip partially, and have referred in proof to Aristophanes, who

* I observe that Prof. Ripley in a very scholarlike article on Prof. Robinson's Lexicon, in the Chris. Review for July, has inadvertently approved of Dr. R.'s definition of the *classical* meaning, Prof. Crawford, of Georgia, in a learned critique in the Chris. Index, has clearly pointed out the mistake.

told the Athenians, that Socrates dipped the feet of a flea in wax, to try how far it could leap. Here it might be alleged by some *partial* lexicographer, *bapto* means to dip, *very* partially, for it is applied to the feet of a flea; and he would just have been as reasonable as Dr. R. He evidently attaches great importance to this discovery* of partialness in the meaning of *baptizo*. We have it again with all the emphasis of italics, at the beginning of the note at the close of the article. "While in Greek writers, as above exhibited from Plato onwards, *baptizo* is everywhere to sink, to immerse, to overwhelm either wholly or *partially*." The Doctor actually seems to think it more important, that the reader should believe in the partialness, than in the totality of the operation. And should his new doctrine be generally received, paedobaptist ministers will have a cheaper way of quieting the scruples of some of their people, than taking them to the rivers and ponds for *total* immersion. They may persuade them, that the word does not classically, nor necessarily, call for immersing the whole body, but merely a part of the body, and that if the babe's little finger, or the tip thereof, be fairly dipped, the ordinance has been administered by immersion, and the little one has been introduced to the church, primitively, and classically: and then the good brethren, who are so scandalized by the Baptist's bigotry about *much* water, may have the satisfaction of seeing the baptismal basin, dwindle beautifully into a lady's *thimble*, as the baptistery has shrunk into the basin. How strange, that a man so learned as the Doctor, did not observe that partialness had no more to do with the word, than putting saliva on the child's nose, or blowing on the water, have to do with baptism. The priest of Rome puts these ingredients into his ordinance of baptism, with just the same propriety as Dr. R. puts his *partialness* into his article on *baptizo*.

3. There is a notable difference between Dr. Robinson's two

* I find that Dr. R. is not entitled to this compliment. John Owen, so far as I know, was the first who insisted on the idea of *partialness*. Dr. Miller took the hint and improved on it, for he actually told his readers that an inspired Evangelist says, "a man is baptized when his hands only are washed." No man who knew Dr. M. will doubt his sincerity. Those who know nothing of baptism but what he tells them, will no doubt be satisfied with his simple assertions; for he brings no proof. I should not have expected Dr. R. to follow these eminent men in this.

editions of his Lexicon. The former has the following significant note :—

“ In the primitive churches, where, according to oriental habits, bathing was to them what washing is to us, the ordinance appears to have been ordinarily, though not necessarily, performed by immersion.”

I call this note significant; for it plainly implies that the ordinary meaning of the word in the New Testament must be immerse. If the primitive churches ordinarily immersed, then the common meaning of the word in the Acts of the Apostles must be immerse. And then what becomes of Dr. R.'s distinction (which he borrows from Schleusner) between the classical meaning of baptizo *immerse*, and the sacred meaning *wash*? Does it not seem to vanish? Perhaps the Doctor found out, that the former note was an awkward admission. At all events he drops it in his second edition, and gives a much longer and very different one from the last. He now denies that bathing is as common with the orientals as washing is with us; for he declares :

“ Against the idea of full immersion in these cases (he means at Pentecost) there lies a difficulty apparently insuperable in the scarcity of water.”

And again :—

“ The same scarcity of water forbade the use of private baths as a general custom; and thus also further precludes the idea of bathing in the passages referred to.”

If then the primitive churches *generally* immersed, and this the Doctor does not yet deny, that immersion could not have been of the same nature as our common washing; and consequently the old resource of oriental habits and hot climate, fails. To avoid one annoyance, the Doctor falls into another more perplexing and perilous.

4. Dr. Robinson's first New Testament meaning of baptizo, is wash. In this he agrees with Schleusner. To make out this remarkable deviation from classical use, he appeals to Luke 11 : 38, compared with Mark 7 : 2, 3. He says the *baptizo* of Luke is *niptomai* in Mark. But it is a palpable mistake, though Schleusner wrote so, fifty years ago. *Baptizo* is not *niptomai* in

Mark, nor any where else. The verse in Mark, to compare with that in Luke, is not the 2d or 3d, but the 4th, for there the same word is used, and the same species of superstition is referred to. Besides, the Doctor goes on to identify *baptizo* with *louo*. Now if *baptizo* is in one place the same with *niptomai*, and in another the same with *louo*, then by the axiom that things that are equal to the same thing are equal to one another—*louo* and *niptomai* must have the same meaning. But this Dr. R. distinctly denies. For he tells us that *louo* *always* means washing the whole body, while he is equally sure that *niptomai* always expresses a partial washing. And no doubt when *baptizo* is out of his mind, he is perfectly accurate in distinguishing the meanings of *louo* and *niptomai*; and therefore he must be wrong on that *troublesome* word.

He gives a color to his perversion of *baptizo*, by falling into a similar mistake about the meaning of the corresponding Hebrew root *Tabal*, which he says is *Rachatz* in 2 Kings 5: 10. Now his own Gesenius shews the absurdity of this, who never mentions *wash* as a meaning of *Tabal*, nor *dip* as a meaning of *Rachatz*. To say that the one is used for the other in that chapter, is sorry criticism. They are used for each other there, just as *dip* and *wash* are used in the English version of the same passage; yet what sort of critic would he be in English, who should pretend on that account, that *dip* and *wash* are just the same in our language? But what would expose any one to contempt in plain English, is vastly profound exegesis in Greek. What would provoke laughter in the kitchen, is listened to with silent admiration in the college.

The next example is Judith. No reason is given why she could not immerse herself in the night, in the camp of Holofernes. We have no right to suppose a new meaning to a word, when the only *known* meaning *may* be understood.

The last example is that of the person defiled by touching a corpse, (Ec. 35: 25,). But why should mere washing be supposed here, when the law of Moses (Num. 19: 19,) required such a man to be *bathed*, which is washing by dipping; and it is to *this* that the Apocrypha refers. And this is all that can be brought forward to shew that *baptizo* in its sacred use means

wash, lave, and cleanse by washing. They who are convinced by such reasons, are surely not hard to satisfy. It is very remarkable, that Dr. R. should have deemed such evidence, sufficient to upset the classical established meaning of the word. More especially, as in this he differs from all those whom he recognizes as the first names in modern criticism—Wahl, Bretschneider, De Wette, and Meyer; and follows the antiquated Schleusner. He tells us “the progress of science in this department has been onward,” and quotes those as the latest cultivators. But their conclusions, though supported by the literature of all ages, he rejects. True, indeed, he is not bound to follow these, nor any men, if he can prove them wrong. An appeal always lies from Lexicons and comments, to the original authors. But this proof has not been furnished. What is brought forward, amounts merely, as we have just shewn, to assertions and suppositions and plain mistakes.

5. Like Schleusner, Dr. Robinson next tells us that *baptizo* means to *baptize*. And this, like his predecessor, he makes the common meaning. Still the question comes up; but what does *baptize* mean in all these passages? The Doctor answers, to administer the rite of baptism. Well but what is that? It is clear Dr. R. *does not know*. This is strong language, but I appeal to every impartial man whether it is too strong. For he has put on record these words: “in Hellenistic usage, and especially in reference to the rite of baptism, it (*baptizo*) would seem to have expressed not always simply immersion, but the more general idea of ablution or affusion.” Mark the hesitation. “*Seem*” indeed! Have we nothing but *seemings* to guide us in obeying Christ? *Baptizo* “when referring to the rite in the New Testament SEEMS not always to express simply immerse!” This implies that *sometimes*, or rather generally, at all events *sometimes*, it (*baptizo*) *does* express simply immersion when referring to the rite in the New Testament. Now *where*? In what *text*? The Doctor does not inform us. He gathers up all the instances, in which the word refers to the rite, and labels them in the lump, baptize. But which of them, and how many, mean simply immerse; and which, and how many, wash or affuse—he gives us no clue to find out. Was this not

because he really had no clue himself? Let us take the Apostolic Commission, which is one of the bundle of texts marked *baptize*. What does Dr. R. suppose our Lord *meant* when he commanded the disciples, *baptizesthai*? Was it simply immerse, or wash, or affuse them? He is too wise to say with some of the unthinking ones, that Christ means any or all of the three. He hesitates, because he feels that one must be meant, and he is afraid to say which; and therefore takes refuge in the decent ambiguity of *baptize*, which is so accommodating as to say any thing that any one pleases to fancy. But this is not to explain the Savior's command. It is to wrap it up. Were the other discourses of the Son of God so handled, they would be shrouded in darkness. The light of the world would be put out. And it is plain were Dr. R. favoring the world with a translation of the New Testament, and were he to render *baptizo* by *baptize*, he would be putting his readers off with a word which he does not himself understand, because in a book devoted to the very purpose of telling us what it means, he is forced to confess, he has failed to make it plain. And if the supposed version of Dr. R. would be dark on the *rite* of baptism, *as dark as his Lexicon*, then it is undeniable, the common version on this point can be no clearer to *him*; and if to him, then surely to most of its readers. Who, then, will say that Dr. R. and the millions like him, do not need, so far at least as this word is concerned, a corrected version?

6. Dr. Robinson, following Schleusner, has a long paragraph on the tropical or figurative application of *baptizo*. This he allows, has always in it the idea of *overwhelming*. But as we asked before on the noun *baptisma*, how can the word always mean figuratively some overwhelming operation, unless literally it mean to overwhelm. For example, he expounds Matt. 3: 11, "He shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit and with fire," as meaning, "he shall overwhelm you in (with) all spiritual gifts; he shall overwhelm you in (with) fire." Now how should the Baptist have told his hearers, figuratively, that Christ would overwhelm them in (with) all spiritual gifts, and in (with) fire, if he himself did not literally overwhelm his disciples in (with) the waters of the Jordan? And if Dr. R. is thus compelled to

allow that John's baptism was an overwhelming in (with) water, can he shew the difference between the admitted overwhelming operation, and the denied immersing one? How *could* John so conveniently, so naturally, overwhelm his disciples in (with) the Jordan, as by dipping them *in* it. Nay, as if to put all this beyond the possibility of doubt or denial, Dr. R. actually declares that this figurative meaning of overwhelming, *directly alludes* to the *rite*. Is it possible then that the rite itself is not an overwhelming one?

7. But how has Dr. Robinson found out all at once this scarcity of water in Jerusalem? He published the first Edition of his Lexicon in 1836. The year following he visited Jerusalem, and actually measured some of its cisterns, and both the upper and lower pools. Surely, then, he is entitled to speak with authority, concerning the water of the city of the Great King. Happily, he has published his travels in the East, and has thereby conferred the highest obligations on all the students of the Bible. Now I must appeal from Dr. R. the Lexicographer, to Dr. R. the most accurate and erudite of travellers. In his *Researches in Palestine, &c.* Vol. 1, pp. 479, &c. he demonstrates that Jerusalem was, and is, a city most admirably watered. It is mainly supplied by cisterns. The house in which Dr. R. resided had four—the largest measuring 30 feet long, 30 broad, and 20 deep. And this was only an example of the better class of houses. “Almost every house in Jerusalem is understood to have one or two.” The temple alone, from its immense reservoirs, could afford the city a tolerable supply. In addition there were the two public pools, besides Siloam and the fountains. After surveying all this, and publishing it, Dr. R. brings out a second edition of his Lexicon, and tells the world, that—

“Against the idea of a total immersion of the Pentecostal converts, there lies the difficulty, apparently insurmountable of a scarcity of water.”

In 1836 he had no difficulty about a full immersion. But in 1850, after measuring Mr. Lanneau's cisterns, and Gihon, and the lower pool, he is compelled to give up the full immersion of the 8000, and of course to drop the note of '36, which declared bathing as common with the orientals as washing with us. One

would think the Doctor must have forgotten when he published his new edition in 1850, what he had been doing 13 years before in Jerusalem. But he actually tells us in his notes on *baptizo* :

"The city is, and was, supplied from its cisterns and public reservoirs. [See Bib. Res. in Pales., pp. 479, 516. From neither of these sources could a supply have been well obtained for the immersion of 8000 persons."

What, all the cisterns not able to supply water for the immersion of 8000. The upper pool with its million and more cubic feet ; the lower with its six millions and more, backed by all the cisterns of the city and the tanks of the temple ; ALL could not WELL supply sufficient water to immerse 8000 persons. Why this is extraordinary. Is Dr. R. prepared to shew the impossibility of Mr. Lanneau's cisterns alone furnishing an adequate supply ? Has he ever made a calculation on the point ? I doubt it. He is indeed experimentally acquainted with the waters of Jerusalem, but he evidently knows nothing experimentally of immersion.

8. Dr. Robinson in his note mentions, as a third consideration, why *baptizo* in sacred Greek cannot mean simply immerse, that :—

"In the earliest Latin versions of the New Testament, as for example the Itala, which Augustine regarded as the best of all, (De Doct. Chris. 2: 15,) and which goes back apparently to the second century, and to usage connected with the Apostolic age (!?), the Greek word *baptizo* is uniformly given in its Latin form *baptizo*, and is never translated by *immergo*, or any like word, shewing there was something in the rite of baptism to which the latter did not correspond."

Undoubtedly there was too much in the rite of baptism, as practised in the 2d century, with which *immergo* could not correspond ; there was crossing, anointing, and eating honey and milk. And if the learned Italian did not wish, that these intruders into the simplicity of Christ's ordinance, should be unmasked and expelled, he could not do better than disguise them under cover of the foreign term. And this convenient covering up of human additions to the ordinance, is not the only effect of transferring instead of translating the word. If men have taken from Christ's ordinance, as well as added to it ; if

sprinkling has been substituted for immersion, the simple device of transferring will equally veil the mutilation. as for 1700 years it has done the additions. And while I would be very sorry to accuse a man, so highly respectable as Dr. R., of an *intentional* suppression of the truth, still if Clement and Chrysostom, speaking their own language, Luther and Calvin, Beza and Bossuet, Salmasius and Milton, Casaubon and Bentley, Selden and Porson, Wahl and Bretschneider and Anthon, are not all mistaken; then the truth is suppressed in his new Lexicon, for he does not say that *baptizo* in the New Testament ever, certainly, in a single text, means simply immerse.

9. Dr. Robinson gives as his last reason why *baptizo* cannot *always* mean simply immerse in the New Testament,—the smallness of the Greek Fonts at Tekoah and Gophna. The reader is assured:—

“The baptismal fonts still found among the ruins of the most ancient Greek churches in Palestine, as at Tekoa and Gophna, and going back apparently to very early times, are not large enough to admit of the baptism of adult persons by immersion; and were obviously never intended for that use.”—[See Bib. Res. in Pal.]

“Were obviously never intended for *that* use!” *What* use? Immersion? Why might not a *babe* be immersed in a font 4 feet by 3 feet 9 inches? Unless immersion were practised when these fonts were used, why should they have been made so large? But the Doctor is speaking of *adult* immersion: and who does not see that in putting in the qualification of adult, he forgot what he was about? What he undertook was to shew why *baptizo* could not always mean simply immerse, when referring to the rite in the New Testament, and he appeals to the fonts to shew that a *man* could not be immersed in them! The point is, were these fonts not made for immersion? This the Doctor must allow, unless he will have it they were made to accommodate the fingers of a sprinkler or a pourer. Surely dipping is dipping, whether the subject is a babe or a man—a moth or a mammoth. Neither is there any propriety in telling us how ancient the fonts were. The more ancient they are, the more ancient do they demonstrate immersion to have been. And if we are told they also prove the antiquity of *infant* immersion,

they prove nothing that any one thinks of denying. Infant immersion came in with infant communion in the 3rd century. Will the Doctor undertake to prove his fonts were built in the 1st century or even the 2d? In a word, when he admits the fonts are Greek, he gives up all, so far as immersion is concerned, for who does not know that the Greek church always *immersed*?

I have thus taken up every point brought forward by Dr. Robinson, on the meaning of the word employed by Christ, to designate his initiatory ordinance; and I leave every impartial reader to judge what weight really belongs to them. If one so learned can say so little, to vindicate a deviation from immersion in this solemn rite, the inference seems irresistible that such deviation is absolutely without excuse.

Dr. Miller assures us that "immersion is not even the common meaning of the word." In his prefatory notice he tells us he did not write for the learned but for common readers. As these would, in a great measure, be dependent on his authority for their views of Christ's ordinance, it was imperatively required, that he should be very careful not, even unintentionally, to mislead them. It is truly painful to think of a good man abusing the great influence he may have received, in drawing away thousands of simple men from the command of the Lord. Whether such is the case here, let the impartial reader judge. Dr. M. refers to the Lexicographers. But we have seen that those of highest name are decidedly against him. Besides, the evidence of Lexicographers must be kept in its own place—which is merely secondary. The makers of Lexicons have their prejudices as well as other men, and these prejudices will pervert the truth, when they come into play. No workman will allow his own work to strike him in the face, if he can help it. On a controverted point, like that of Baptism, we are bound to make allowance for the partiality of the Lexicographer. If Dr. Carson or Dr. Gill had left a lexicon behind him, there would have been little use in bringing forward his definition of *baptizo*: the pædobaptist would have reasonably objected; Dr. C. or Dr. G. was a Baptist; of course he will say all he can for his own side. Now, the fact happens to be, that all the lexicographers are

pædobaptists. Should we, then, not make allowance for this fact, in judging of what some say about washing, as a meaning of *baptizo*? And what irresistible force does this consideration lend the testimony of Wahl, and Bretschneider, and Schleusner! They are not speaking for their party; but against it. Their knowledge and honesty, as Philologists, triumph over their feelings as pædobaptists and partizans; and they assure us that *baptismos*, in the New Testament, means immersion and immersion alone. If, "in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word must be established," where can we find witnesses more competent than these?

Dr. M. actually asserts, and, I perceive, the latest edition continues the assertion in all its primitive strength, "All impartial judges—by which I mean, all the most profound and mature Greek scholars, who are neither theologians nor sectarians, agree in pronouncing that the term in question, imports the application of water by sprinkling, affusion," &c. Now, this *is* curious. The Dr. seems to imply that theologians and sectarians are suspicious witnesses. But this rule would go far to exclude the testimony of Dr. M. himself, for surely he was a theologian, and though not a sectarian, yet, at all events, a stiff stickler for Presbytery. Why, then, should he seem to rely so much on his own bare word, telling his simple readers, "I assure you, the word does signify the application of water in any way"? "What does such arguing prove," except that Dr. M. thought his party and himself right? If his testimony were *against* himself, then we might allow it great weight. The Baptist might then appeal with great force to his evidence, and any prejudice or sectarianism that might attach to the Dr.'s character, so far from weakening what he admitted, would go to establish it, just in proportion to the bias that drew him aside; for the stronger the bias, the greater the force of opposing evidence would it require to be overcome. Now it is highly absurd, to fancy that the force of Calvin's testimony, in behalf of the exclusive meaning of *baptizo*, as immerse, can be evaded, by saying he was prejudiced and a sectarian; because his prejudice and sect were not favored by *baptizo* meaning immerse, but the very opposite. And consequently, the bitterer his hatred of the anabaptists, as

he called them, the clearer must the meaning of *baptizo* have been, to compel even him to allow, that in this fundamental point in the dispute, they were right.

So with regard to Beza. It is generally allowed that, admirable scholar and good man as he was, his great defect, as a translator, was his proneness to give things a twist, so as to make the Holy Spirit speak Calvinistically. But, strong as his prejudice might be, it was not strong enough to make him maintain, with Dr. Miller, that *baptizo* means sprinkling. On the contrary, he declares it is certain, Christ commands us to be immersed. There may be too much reason to fear, that both Calvin and Beza were not absolutely unwilling to burn the baptists; but they would not belie them, by putting them in the wrong, when they knew them to be right. How overwhelming, then, must the evidence for the Baptists have been, to compel them to such an admission. The truth is, they were both profoundly learned and thoroughly honest, and, therefore, they would speak what they knew to be true. Had either their learning or their honesty been less, the result might have been different.

As to the assertion that "all the most profound and mature Greek scholars agree in *baptizo* signifying sprinkling, pouring," &c., it is singular how Dr. Miller ever ventured on making it; and it is still more remarkable how the scholars on the Presbyterian Board should allow it to stand unerased. "ALL the most profound," &c.!! Why, Casaubon was surely tolerably profound;—did he say so? Bentley was certainly no blockhead,—but he says *baptismos* is dipping. Porson's head, it is allowed, was not always very clear; but it has never been alleged, that he was maudlin when he smiled and said, the Baptists were right about *baptizo*. The simple truth is, and no man, having any regard to his standing as a scholar, will venture to gainsay it, these three are "the first three" for knowledge of Greek, in England's literary history. They all concur that *baptizo* means immerse, but *not sprinkle*; and yet not one of them was a Baptist; and who ever called them either theologians or sectarians? The assertion, therefore, is one of the most astounding ever fallen into by a man so respectable as the late Dr. Miller. So far from *all* the first-rate Grecians agreeing that *baptizo*

means sprinkle, there is not a single *one* that ever said so. The only authority mentioned by Dr. M., is John Owen. Doubtless he was a man of extraordinary erudition and profound piety. Still, no scholar will ever think of him, when talking of the Casaubons and Bentleys, who have made Grecian literature what it is. He was, besides a great theologian, and a staunch Congregationalist, and so far an incompetent witness, according to Dr. M.'s test. Let him go for what he is worth ; he refutes Dr. M., for he does not affirm that the *word* means to sprinkle. He says, its original and natural meaning is to dip, though it also signifies (as he thinks) to wash, to pour. Even the Dr.'s favorite authority, then, is against him ; nay, his testimony, so far as it goes, settles the whole controversy. For, if the *natural* meaning of *baptizo* is to immerse, it were strange, indeed, that a Lawgiver so wise, so condescending to the simple, so considerate of the poor, so sympathetic with his little ones, as our adorable King always is, should proclaim his law of baptism in a word employed in an unnatural sense.

Dr. Miller asserts there is not the smallest probability that John ever immersed. But Calvin not only tells us it is probable he did ; he says, it is certain. " We clearly see it," says the candid learned Reformer. All the great scholars that have lived since the Baptist, say nothing else. What, then, are we to think of these things ? It is high time that an expurgated edition of the Dr.'s work were prepared by the Presbyterian Board, and that the superior learning that still shines on Princeton, should arise and dispel such darkness.

IV. " Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." This injunction is at once very comprehensive, very precise, and very significant. " All things," not one thing, even the least was to be left out. No matter how much the things might differ in relative importance. In so far as they were commanded by Christ, they all stood on a level, and it was impossible to tamper with what might seem the least, without implicit rebellion. " Whosoever shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, the same shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven." But not only does the language imply that we must not come short of what Christ has

commanded, it is equally precise in rebuking all that goes beyond or beside Christ's word. Even those who profess to have come out from Rome, insist on the right of the church to legislate in things indifferent, and they make very loud, and very exclusive pretensions to be the successors of the Apostles too. But did not Christ prohibit the Apostles teaching anything but what he had commanded? And if Peter dared not go beyond *whatsoever* Christ commanded, what shall we think of him who continually dinning us about apostolic authority, gives commands which Christ never gave, and Peter never dreamed of. I care not whether he pretend to be a successor of the Apostles, or an Apostle himself, I must hold him in this, antichristian.

This plain view of Christ's word settles the question of communion, in the Lord's Supper. "Do this in remembrance of me," was one of the things which Christ had commanded his Apostles. In this last commission, he distinctly commands the apostles to immerse believers, before instructing them about their privilege of eating the supper. This is *His* order, and who may subvert it? The Apostles evidently understood it so. The first thing the Pentecostal converts were commanded to do was to be immersed; and then, and not till then, did they unite with the church in the breaking of bread. And whatever liberty professors have taken with the other arrangements of Christ, there is no denomination that has not insisted on putting Baptism before the Supper in the order of observance. There is, however, a special odium attached by many to the Baptists, on the score that they will not eat the supper out of their own circle. But the censure is mistaken. Baptists do not seek to please themselves in this, nor to arrogate peculiar claims to sanctity. They simply desire to obey their Master. They believe with Calvin, that Christ, in the commission, has commanded believer immersion, and they dare not substitute for this, infant sprinkling. This they believe is a mere human invention, that mistakes sprinkling for immersion, and a babe for a believer. And it is impossible for them to admit any one to the Lord's table, who has not been immersed on a credible profession of his faith in Christ, without deliberately disobeying what they are solemnly convinced is their Lord's will.

V, and lastly. The blessed assurance of his presence till he come again, "and lo I am with you alway, even to the end of the world." This, then, is our joy, that we are not alone. In preaching salvation through his name, He is with us. In immersing the believers, He is with us. In teaching the immersed believers to observe the ordinance of the breaking of bread, and in doing as we teach, He is with us. This consoles us in the midst of multiplying and mistaken censures from those we love and over whom we yearn. Lord, thou knowest it is for thy sake thy people subject themselves to misapprehension and dislike. But even though we may be hated for doing as thou hast commanded, thy presence, thine approbation, are more than a compensation. Give us thy patience, thy love, that if we are reviled, we may not revile again, but, contrariwise, bless. Are we not called to inherit a blessing? Art thou not even now saying to us, "fear not little flock, it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom." Our debts then shall not depress us, for they are our's no more; they have disappeared in the fountain of thy blood; and thy divine righteousness is a full equivalent for the kingdom that cannot be moved, and as that righteousness has been made ours through faith, we know that we are monarchs in disguise. We love thine appearing. We pant for the crown. Come then, O Thou beloved of thy Father; the Spirit and the Bride say come! Thy Bride, Thy blood-bought, blood-washed Bride, cries come quickly! All creation is in labor pangs for Thy presence. Come, oh Son of man, from thy Father's throne, and welcome her, for whom thou didst die, to her place on thine own throne, at that side which the spear PIERCED FOR HER.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
The Ordinance of Baptism founded in Christ's Universal Authority. . . .	5
The Commission concerns believers only—conceded by Calvin. . . .	6
Calvin's twofold definition of a sacrament excludes Infants from Baptism	7
Also, the definition of the Shorter Catechism.	7
Calvin's Anti-Puseyism—Calvin's Puseyism	8
Calvin's contradiction pervades all Reformed formulas and confessions—	
Westminster Shorter Catechism and Confession.	9
Heidelberg Catechism, &c., &c.—Episcopal Churches.	10
Circumcision no ground for Infant Baptism—Council of Jerusalem—Gala-	
tians—Timothy. ,	11
Circumcision sealed Abraham's faith, but not Isaac's, &c.	12
The promise to the seed threefold—The meaning of Circumcision threefold	13
Twins of the 3d century—The Scholars of Germany allow that the Apos-	
tles knew nothing of Infant Baptism—yet defend it. Neander's pre-	
sumption.	14
Use to be made of the Germans.	15
<i>Baptizo</i> means nothing but Immerse.—Twelve Witnesses.	16
Calvin allows that John immersed Christ.—The current of criticism, past	
and present, flows the same way.	17
Christ's command, expounded and enforced by his example, explicit.—	
Calvin's Inconsistency.	18
(Romans 6 : 3, 4.) Calvin's Comment on the Eunuch <i>seems</i> to imply that	
Christ's <i>Word</i> may be of small moment.	19
Christ never spake a trifling word.	20
Calvin plays the Pope on Baptism.—Believer Immersion, and the founda-	
tion of Heaven, identical.	21
Sacred Lexicographers of Germany, Schleusner, Wahl, and Bretschneider,	
unanimous that <i>baptisma</i> means nothing but immersion.—Inconsis-	
tency of Schleusner.—Campbell of Aberdeen.	22
Calvin <i>ought</i> to have translated <i>the word</i> immerse.	23

Dr. Robinson mainly copies Schleusner on <i>baptizo</i> ,—where he differs, falls into errors of his own.—1. Dr. R. does not literally explain <i>baptisma</i>	24
2. Dr. R. spoils the classical meaning of the word.	25
3. Dr. R. takes back a former admission, but falls into a <i>greater</i> difficulty.	26
4. Dr. R. has no good reasons for making any difference between <i>baptizo</i> in the classics and in the Scriptures, &c.	27
5. Dr. R. does not know the meaning of baptize, and needs a version that shall explain it.	28 29
6. Dr. R. inconsistent on the figurative meaning of the word.	30
7. Dr. R.'s singular perplexity as a Lexicographer, contrasted with his accuracy as a Traveller.	30 31
8. Dr. R. mistakes the bearing of the fact that the old Latin version did not render <i>baptizo</i> by <i>immergo</i>	31
9. Dr. R., in what he says about the fonts of Tekoah and Gophna, forgets what he is about.	32
Dr. Miller claims the Lexicographers; whereas the best of them are against him.—Great force of the fact that these are <i>not</i> Baptists.	33
Dr. M. claims all the <i>great</i> Greek scholars,—whereas there is not <i>one</i> on <i>his</i> side.—Dr. M. mistakes the value of <i>his own</i> assertion on the meaning of <i>baptizo</i> .— <i>Peculiar</i> force of Calvin's and Beza's testimony.	34 35
Dr. M.'s solitary witness, John Owen, really against him.	36
The Order of the <i>Commission</i> —enforced by Apostolic example—settles the question of Communion in the Supper.	37
Comfort of Christ's spiritual presence.—His Advent the true hope of His Church.	38





3 0112 059259298

THE REVISED NEW TESTAMENT,
EDITED BY
SPENCER H. CONE & WILLIAM H. WYCKOFF,
ALSO, ALL PUBLICATIONS OF THE
American Bible Union,

May be procured of
E. H. TRIPP, BOOKSELLER AND STATIONER,
No. 272 Greenwich Street, New York.

E. H. T. has always for sale a GENERAL ASSORTMENT of

BIBLES,

from the large Folio and Quarto to the smallest Pocket Editions.

TESTAMENTS, HYMN BOOKS,

USED BY THE VARIOUS DENOMINATIONS, &c., &c. ALSO,

MISCELLANEOUS, JUVENILE & TOY BOOKS,

SCHOOL BOOKS,

COPY BOOKS, SLATES, PENCILS, QUILLS, GOLD AND STEEL PENS, &c.

On the most reasonable terms, wholesale and retail.

WRITING PAPERS

Of every kind and quality. SERMON PAPER cut to size and
ruled for Clergymens' use.

A LARGE STOCK OF

BLANK BOOKS

always on hand, and made to order. All of the best materials
and workmanship.